

over Claims 1, 2, 12-17, 23-25, 30, 31, 32, and 36 of co-pending U.S. Application No. 10/580,607 and Claims 1, 10-12, 15, 18-23, 25, 26, 36, and 41 of co-pending Application No. 10/580,718.

At the outset, Applicants note with appreciation the courtesy of a personal interview granted by Examiner Robert Williams and Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) Daniel Stodola to Applicants' representative on April 20, 2010. In combination with the Interview Summary provided by Examiners Williams and Stodola, the substance of the personal interview is substantially summarized below in accordance with MPEP § 713.04.

Regarding the restriction of Claims 18 and 19 as drawn to a non-elected invention, Applicants respectfully traverse that rejection as follows. Claim 18 is amended to recite “providing” followed by a listing of all of the components recited in amended independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 18 requires all of the features of amended independent Claim 1 and further recites method steps of assembling the components recited in Claim 1. As discussed in the personal interview, MPEP § 1850 states that an independent claim for a process especially adapted for the manufacturer of a product is permitted to be included even though such a claim may be directed to a different statutory category of invention than the product itself. Claim 18 recites a process of assembling the product of Claim 1 and should be examined together with Claim 1 as set forth in MPEP § 1850. In this regard, Claim 18 is amended to remove the phrase “based on an initial assembly according to Claim 1.” This language is replaced with an explicit recitation of the features recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the restriction requirement (lack of unity objection) should be withdrawn.

Regarding the objection to the drawings as not showing all of the features recited in Claim 14, Claim 14 is canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection to the drawings is negated.